

University of Dayton
eCommons

[ECAS Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate](#)

1-14-2011

2011-01-14 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2011-01-14 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2011). *ECAS Minutes*. 220.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/220

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in ECAS Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
January 14, 2011; 9 a.m.
St. Mary's Hall Room 113B

Present: Judith Huacuja, Andrea Seielstad, Heidi G Gauder, Corinne Daprano, Leno M Pedrotti, Rebecca Wells, Joseph Saliba, Paul Benson

Guests: None

Opening Meditation: Judith Huacuja opened the meeting with a meditation.

Minutes: The minutes of the December 13, 2010 meeting were deferred.

Announcements:

The new engineering representative is Partha Banarjee.

David Biers has announced his resignation from ECAS but will continue to serve on the Senate. An ECAS representative from Social Sciences will therefore need to be selected at the January 14 Senate meeting, as previously agreed by ECAS members via email correspondence.

Old Business: None.

New Business:

New Degree Program Proposal: The Program Development Plan (PDPP). At the request of APC representatives during the last semester, who indicated there were insufficient guidelines regarding the approval of new degree programs, Paul Vanderburg prepared a document. He presented it to the Provost's Council and it was met with good reception. It includes guidelines about the university-wide process of reviewing and approving undergraduate degrees as well as the content of what needs to go into application for appropriate analysis and decision-making. In the course of discussion, it was pointed out that there are already two Senate documents containing guidelines for new undergraduate and graduate degree programs: Document 94-95 (university policy for initiation or suspension of undergraduate degree programs) and Document 95-96 (Guide for Initiation of A New Graduate Degree Program).

It was pointed out that the Vanderburg proposal does not include as much detail regarding content, most notably information about finances, that the existing documents set forth. Some members emphasized the importance of including revenue flows relative to costs and the need for reallocation of resources. Expected returns should be included also, not just costs. The expected value of each proposal should be included in either financial or qualitative terms, or both. Others pointed out the Provost's Office also requires a lot of the cost and revenue information, suggesting that the document direct applicants to follow the Senate documents

and must consult the Provost's office for guidance about additional formatting and information that might be required. It was generally agreed that with respect to the content of each application, we needed to more carefully compare the Vanderburg document with the existing policies and determine whether there is a need to propose further language or revisions, in which case we would have to refer the proposal to APC for review. It is possible that the existing documents sufficiently cover the issue of content such that no further action is required.

With regard to process, the process contained in the Vanderburg document mirrors that previously outlined by the Provost: namely, that any new proposal needs to go sequentially from the Unit to ECAS to the Senate to the Provost and Provost's Council, finally, the President. Major substantive changes may require review by bodies at earlier stages in the process. Some emphasized the importance of involving the faculty early on because they have authority of the curriculum. An argument was advanced that the Provost's Council should not review the decisions of the Senate, such that Senate review would come at a different stage or, before and after, Provost Council Review. Some concerns were raised also about when and the extent to which adequate consultation with library and other supportive services would be conducted to determine whether staff, faculty, information resources, and facilities are adequate to sustain the new program. It was agreed that committee members will compare the proposed document with existing Senate versions, that Judith will convey minor changes discussed to P. Vanderburg, and that we will need to determine at a future meeting whether this should become a numbered Senate document and referred to the APC.

Process for Selecting University-wide CAP Committees. The Senate, through ECAS and the APC, has authority for the appointment of two CAP-related committees: a CAP and Competencies Committee (that will eventually replace the University General Education Committee and work with the Provost's Office in developing the courses and procedures for implementing the CAP curriculum), and the CAP Leadership Team (which will act as advocates for CAP, particularly with respect to its integration in the professional schools). J. Huacuja announced the need to appoint membership of these committees. Nominations are coming in from all the deans and Provost's Office. ECAS and APC along with the UNRC may make nominations also. The goal is to make sure the committees are ready to start working on March 1. J. Huacuja proposed that the nominations process be completed by February 1. Thereafter, it was suggested that Assistant Provosts S. Hunley, P. Donnelly and D. Bickford review the list of nominations, along with J. Huacuja, A. Jipson, J. Hess, and D. Pair, and make recommendations to ECAS. ECAS has authority to select the CAP and Competencies Committee. APC will select the CAP Leadership Team and forward its recommendations to ECAS also. ECAS members agreed with this approach and timeline.

Provost Announcements. Provost Saliba announced that within the next two weeks, his office will encourage faculty to participate in a number of strategic initiatives. Issues include (1) the CAP implementation progress report, (2) implementation of post-tenure review document that the Senate passed last spring, (3) update on Sexual Misconduct Education Prevention and Response Task Force; (4) Transfer Strategy Task Force (for attracting transfer students); (5)

update on 1st Year Coordinating Team; (6) mission and identity, including consideration of common language, structures, and alignment of mission and identity initiatives; (7) Alcohol Task Force; and (8) the Higher Learning Commission Diversity Report. If faculty have any concerns or ideas they would like to relay or would otherwise like to engage in the work of any of these initiatives, they should contact the respective task force representatives. There will be an email circulated about these initiatives and information will be posted on porches.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00.

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Seielstad